

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 10-14, 16-27, 31-35 and 37-42 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 17, 20-22, 38, 41 and 42 have been amended, and Claims 9, 15, 30 and 36 have been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants would initially like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to participate in a telephonic interview on September 9, 2009. While no agreement was reached, Applicants' representative pointed out why they believed the claimed two-step conversion process was novel and non-obvious over the teachings of the cited references.

### I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 1-6, 9-27 and 30-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lowell (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,086), hereinafter "Lowell", Braun et al. (International Publication No. WO 01/50226 A2), hereinafter "Braun", Sena et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033331 A1), hereinafter "Sena", and Friedman (U.S. Patent No. 7,519,911), hereinafter "Friedman". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Specification description at page 13 regarding the two-step conversion process having an intermediate viewable format in order to further highlight the highly automated nature of the claimed system for providing viewable streaming media data where the streaming media data is itself used in determining what codec to use for converting such media data from the initial format to the viewable format, and yet the streaming media data is stored in a format as specified by manual user input. These claimed features thus advantageously allow for viewing the data in a format as automatically determined by the data processing system, and storing the streaming data in a format as manually specified by the user input. In contrast, Sena's system only uses manual user input to determine specific conversion modules to be used in data conversion (Sena page 9, paragraph [0099]), with the data being stored in the *same* viewable format (Figure 5B, block 948). Thus, it is urged that the present amendment to Claim 1 has overcome the rejection of such claim.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 2-6, 10-14 and 16 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-6, 10-14 and 16 depend upon). Claims 9 and 15 have been cancelled herewith.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 17-27, 31-35 and 37-42 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1. Claims 30 and 36 have been cancelled herewith.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-6, 9-27 and 30-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**II. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants